

arguing that the inventions lack unity of invention under the provisions of PCT Rule 13 because the apparatus claims lack the step(s) characterizing the process claims.

Applicants stand by their election of Claims 1 to 10 made in the reply dated July 15, 2004.

Traversal of the Examiner's restriction requirement is, however, respectfully solicited. The PCT Administrative Instructions, Annex B, Part 1, subsection (e), specifically explains that PCT Rule 13 permits, in particular, the inclusion of claims drawn to a process and to an apparatus which is specifically designed for carrying out the process. Applicants' process and apparatus claims meet those requirements since applicants' process as defined in independent Claim 11 requires that the process be conducted in the apparatus defined in independent Claim 1. The step(s) characterizing applicants' process therefore logically correspond to features which characterize applicants' apparatus. PCT Rule 13.2 refers to "the same or corresponding special technical features" (*emphasis added*) which characterize the technical relationship between the claimed inventions. Accordingly, unity of invention within the definition of PCT Rule 13.2, does not require that the claimed inventions have the same, or identical, special technical features. It is therefore respectfully requested that the restriction requirement be withdrawn. Favorable action is solicited.

Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including Extension of Time fees, to Deposit Account No. 11.0345. Please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,
KEIL & WEINKAUF



Daniel S. Kim
Reg. No. 51,877

1350 Connecticut Ave, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20036
(202) 659-0100

HBK/BAS